1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669				
2	City Attorney JOANNE HOEPER, State Bar #114961				
3	Chief Trial Attorney SEAN F. CONNOLLY, State Bar # 152235				
4	Deputy City Attorney   Fox Plaza   1390 Market Street, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor				
5	San Francisco, California 94102-5408   Telephone: (415) 554-3863				
6	Facsimile: (415) 554-3837  E-Mail: sean.connolly@sfgov.org				
7	Attorneys for Defendants				
8	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ET AL.				
9					
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	ESTHER HWANG,	Case No. C07-02718 MMC			
13	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S UNAUTHORIZED SUR-			
14	vs.  REPLY TO OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE; ALTERNATIVELY, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ET AL.  DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE RESPONSE TO		CTIONS TO		
15			EQUEST FOR		
16	PLAINTIFF'S UNAUTHORIZED FILING				
17		Hearing Date:	Sept. 12, 2008		
18		Time: Place:	9:00 AM No. 7		
19		Trial Date:	Oct. 27. 2008		
20					
21	INTRODUCTION				
22	On July 25, 2008 defendants filed their motion for partial summary judgment. On August 22,				
23	2008, plaintiff filed her opposition. On August 29, 2008, defendants timely filed their reply,				
24					
			objections to plaintiff's evidence, and an administrative motion requesting leave to file a declaration		
25	objections to plaintiff's evidence, and an adminis	strative motion requesti	ng leave to file a declaration		
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	objections to plaintiff's evidence, and an adminisum under seal. Pursuant to local rule 7-3(d) no other	_	_		
	-	_	_		

CCSF MOT TO STRIKE CASE NO. C07-02718 MMC

However, on September 5, 2008, plaintiff filed an unauthorized surreply (misleadingly entitled titled "opposition") to defendants' objections to evidence. Plaintiff did not seek leave of the court as required by local rule. Furthermore, plaintiff's "opposition" is a wholesale attempt to argue the objections and insert other improper arguments in the long frowned upon tradition of an unauthorized "surreply."

Because plaintiff's "opposition" is improper, because it is a misleading attempt to reargue issues raised in the initial opposition, and because plaintiff failed to seek the court's permission first, it should be stricken. Alternatively, defendants request leave of the court to file a response to the filing.

## **ARGUMENT**

## Plaintiff's Second "Opposition" (or Surreply) Was Unauthorized and Therefore Should Be Stricken.

The Northern District Civil Local Rules permit the parties to a motion to file *only* an opposition (by the non-moving party), a reply (by the moving party) and, if applicable, a notice of recent judicial decisions decided after the opposition or reply were filed. *See* Civil Local Rule 7-3. "Otherwise, once a reply is filed, *no additional memoranda, papers or letters may be filed without prior Court approval.*" (Civ. L.R. 7-3(d) [emphasis added].) The Court has authority to strike any pleading that is filed without leave of court in violation of its rules.

This very Court has discouraged exactly the same tactic used here by plaintiff in the past. In *Powell v. Fidelity National*, 2003 WL 22134854 (N.D. Cal. 2003)(MMC), plaintiff submitted a "Request to File Objection and Objection" to defendants' reply brief. Civil Local Rule 7-3(d) provides that "once a reply is filed, no additional memoranda, papers or letters may be filed without prior court approval." Civ. L.R. 7-3(d). The Honorable Judge Chesney found plaintiff's "Objection" to be "unhelpful and unnecessary" (page 3), denied Powell's request that it be filed, and ordered that the unauthorized pleading be "STRICKEN from the record" (*Id.* at 3)(emphasis in original). The Court should do the same with respect to plaintiffs' veiled attempt to improperly argue issues.

Other courts also discourage this practice. *Cleveland v. Porca Co.*, 38 F.3d 289, 297 (7th Cir. 1994) In *Cleveland*, plaintiff there did precisely the same thing as plaintiff here: he filed an unauthorized response to defendants reply on a summary judgment motion, without seeking leave of the court. The court stated:

The Local Rules provide for three briefs: an initial brief, a response to that brief, and a reply brief [citations omitted]. They do not provide for the filing of a response to a reply brief. [citations omitted]. And it is within the district court's discretion to strike an unauthorized filing. [citations omitted]. The plaintiffs claim that the district court abused its discretion because the "response to the reply brief" was a filing necessary to respond to new issues the defendants raised in their reply briefs. If that was the case, however, the proper response was a motion to strike the offending portions of the reply brief or to seek leave to file a response to the reply brief. [citations omitted]. The plaintiffs followed neither course. Under these circumstances, it was not an abuse of discretion to strike the unauthorized filings. *Id*.

Plaintiff's tactic is clearly unauthorized and discouraged. Her "opposition to objections" should be stricken, or in the alternative, defendants should be given leave to respond.

Dated: September 5, 2008

DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney JOANNE HOEPER Chief Trial Deputy SEAN F. CONNOLLY Deputy City Attorney

y:\_\_\_\_\_\_/s/ SEAN F. CONNOLLY Attorneys for Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.